

Appln. No.: 10/631,071

Supplemental Response dated March 11, 2008

Reply to Office action of Aug. 20, 2007 and discussion with Examiner of March 10, 2008

### **REMARKS**

Claims 30-298 were pending at the time of the Office Action.

Claims 48-49, 119-187, 211, 213 and 244-298 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 48-49, 119-187 and 244-298 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 for allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 48-49, 119-187 and 244-298 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for allegedly overlapping two different statutory classes of invention.

Claims 30-47, 50-118, 188-210, 212 and 214-243 stand allowed.

Claims 152, 213 and 268 have been canceled without prejudice.

New claims 299-302 were added by the previous amendment, filed Feb. 20, 2008.

For at least the reasons stated below, the Applicants traverse the rejections of claims 48-49, 119-187, 211, 213 and 244-298 and submit that all pending claims, including the new claims added by the previous amendment, are allowable.

### **Examiner Interview**

On March 10, 2008, the Examiner and the Applicants' representative discussed the rejection of claims 48-49, 119-187, 244-298 and 301-302. The Applicants thank the Examiner for the Examiner's efforts to advance prosecution of the present Application. During the course of multiple discussions, the Examiner, the Examiner's Supervisor and the Applicants' representative reached agreement on claim amendments that would render claims 48-49, 119-187, 244-298 and 301-302 allowable. The Examiner agreed to accept a Supplemental Amendment to implement the agreed-upon amendments.

### **Claim Amendments**

The Applicants continue to maintain that claims 48-49, 119-187, 244-298 and 301-302 were allowable in their previous form. For example, the specification discloses various portions

Appln. No.: 10/631,071

Supplemental Response dated March 11, 2008

Reply to Office action of Aug. 20, 2007 and discussion with Examiner of March 10, 2008

of the preferred embodiment in software terms and includes software appendices. Also for example, the specification discusses apparatus including a processor (*e.g.*, at col. 19, lines 20-25, mentioning the terminal having a CPU). The Applicants maintain that such a CPU qualifies as an exemplary electrical circuit and/or processor. Nonetheless, to expedite the issuance of claims 48-49, 119-187, 244-298 and 301-302, and other pending claims, the Applicants have amended such claims in the agreed-upon manner.

### **Summary**

In summary, the Applicants respectfully submit that all claims currently pending in the Application are allowable. Accordingly, the Applicants courteously solicit an expeditious notice of allowance for all pending claims. If the Examiner disagrees or has questions regarding this submission, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner telephone the undersigned at 312-775-8000.

Though the Applicants do not believe additional fees are due for the present Supplemental Response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge additional fee(s) or credit overpayment(s) to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Dated: March 11, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Shawn L. Peterson/

Shawn L. Peterson

Reg. No. 44,286

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.  
500 W. Madison St., Ste. 3400  
Chicago, IL 60661  
(312) 775-8000